UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,447	06/25/2003	Mikael Nilsson	P14809-US1	4367

7590   06/12/2007

John C. Han
Ericsson, Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVW 2-C-2
Plano, TX 75024

EXAMINER
POPHAM, JEFFREY D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2137	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/603,447	NILSSON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey D. Popham	2137	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 April 2007</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,5,7-9,11-17,20-25 and 29-35* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,5,7-9,11-17,20-25 and 29-35* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>25 June 2003</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

Remarks

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-9, 11-17, 20-25, and 29-35 are pending.

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 5, 7-9, 11-17, 20-25, and 29-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Objections

2.   Claims 1, 5, 14, 15, 17, 22, 23, and 29 are objected to because of the following informalities:

-   Claim 1, line 5 refers to "an intermediate proxy server". The rest of claim 1 refers to this proxy as "intermediary proxy server". Consistent use of either "intermediate" or "intermediary" is requested. In the rejections, the examiner has used "intermediary", since "intermediary proxy server" is used more often in the claims.

-   Claim 1, 4 lines from the bottom, refers to "the service/ information content server". Since there has been no such server previously in the claim, this has been construed as "the service/information/content provider".

-   Claim 5 refers to "the second protocol", which should apparently read "the second communication protocol".

-   Claims 14 and 15 refer to "the user preferences relating to privacy level". Since such a limitation has not been seen previously in the in the claims from

which claims 14 and 15 depend, this limitation has been construed as "user

preferences relating to privacy level".

- Claims 17 and 22 refer to "the protection proxy server", which has not been

  seen in previous claims. For purposes of prior art rejection, this has been

  construed as "the protection server".

- Claim 23, the final limitation states "allowing the service provider having

  acquired the protection server...". The examiner is unsure how a service

  provider acquires the protection server. Therefore, for purposes of prior art

  rejection, this portion has been construed as "allowing a

  service/information/content provider having accessed the protection server..."

- Claim 29 refers to "the agreement", which has not been previously seen in the

  claims from which claim 29 depends. For purposes of prior art rejection, this

  has been construed as "an agreement".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-9, 11, 12, 20, 23, 24, 30, 31, and 33-35 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steele (U.S. Patent 7,016,877) in view of

Yasala (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0188156).

        Regarding Claim 1,

                Steele discloses an arrangement for protection of end user

        personal profile data in a communication system including a number of

        end user stations and a number of service/information/content providers or

        holding means holding end user personal profile data, the arrangement

        comprising:

                An intermediary proxy server supporting a first communication

        protocol for end user station communication (Figure 8, numeral 105; and

        Column 7, line 46 to Column 8, line 24);

                A personal profile data protection server supporting a second

        communication protocol for communication with the intermediary proxy

        server and a third communication protocol for communication with one of

        the service/information/content providers, the personal profile data

        protection server further comprises an API allowing

        service/information/content provider queries/interactions, and storing

        means for storing end user specific data and end user personal profile

        data (Figure 8, numerals 102 and 108; Column 8, line 25 to Column 9, line

        57);

Wherein the service/information/content provider can request, via the API, personal profile data and in that personal profile data is delivered according to end user preferences or in such a manner that there is no association between the actual end user and the personal profile data of the end user (Column 9, line 42 to Column 10, line 52; and Column 12, lines 4-16); and

Authentication via certificates and/or SSL (Column 8, lines 1-24);

But does not explicitly disclose the personal profile data protection server having a protection certificate and the verification of such certificate.

Yasala, however, discloses the personal profile data protection server having a protection certificate (Paragraphs 27-31);

Means for providing published certificates to the intermediary proxy server (Paragraphs 27-31); and

Wherein the intermediary proxy server further comprises means for verifying the genuinity of the protection certificate requested over the second communication protocol from the personal profile data protection server against a published certificate and, responsive to a verified genuine protection certificate of the personal profile data protection server, allowing authenticated communications to commence (Paragraphs 27-31). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the authentication and authorization

system of Yasala into the trusted brokering system of Steele in order to
provide strong mutual authentication and/or authorization of both entities
such that a secure channel can be formed, while allowing each system to
decide who it trusts and who it does not trust.

Regarding Claim 2,

Steele as modified by Yasala discloses the arrangement of claim 1,
in addition, Steele discloses that the first communication protocol is a
secure protocol (Figure 8, numeral 105; and Column 7, line 46 to Column
8, line 24).

Regarding Claim 5,

Steele as modified by Yasala discloses the arrangement of claim 1,
in addition, Yasala discloses that the second communication protocol is a
secure protocol (Paragraphs 27-31).

Regarding Claim 7,

Steele as modified by Yasala discloses the arrangement of claim 1,
in addition, Steele discloses that the intermediary proxy server is a HTTP
proxy (Figure 8, numeral 105; and Column 7, line 46 to Column 8, line 44).

Regarding Claim 8,

Steele as modified by Yasala discloses the arrangement of claim 1,
in addition, Yasala discloses that the intermediary proxy server comprises
holding means for holding published certificates (Paragraphs 25-31).

Regarding Claim 9,

Steele as modified by Yasala discloses the arrangement of claim 1,

in addition, Yasala discloses that the intermediary proxy server is in

communication with external holding means holding published certificates

(Paragraphs 22, 23, and 27-31).

Regarding Claim 11,

Steele as modified by Yasala discloses the arrangement of claim 1,

in addition, Steele discloses that the intermediary proxy server is located

within an intranet or at the operator's premises (Figure 8, numeral 105;

and Column 7, line 46 to Column 8, line 24).

Regarding Claim 12,

Steele as modified by Yasala discloses the arrangement of claim 1,

in addition, Steele discloses that the intermediary proxy server comprises

a functionality for establishing a security communication agreement with

the protection server (Figure 8, numeral 105; and Column 7, line 46 to

Column 8, line 24); and Yasala discloses that the intermediary proxy

server comprises a functionality for establishing a security communication

agreement with the protection server (Paragraphs 27-31).

Regarding Claim 20,

Steele as modified by Yasala discloses the arrangement of claim 1,

in addition, Steele discloses that the protection server storing means

comprises at least three tables containing information about end user

specific data, personal profile data information and statistical data respectively (Figures 3-4; and Column 14, line 10 to Column 16, line 4).

Regarding Claim 23,

Steele discloses a method for protection of end user personal profile data in a communication system with a number of end user stations and a number of service/information/content providers, the method comprises the steps of:

Providing communication an intermediary proxy server in communication with an end user station using a first communication protocol, to the protection server over a second communication protocol (Column 7, line 46 to Column 8, line 59);

Providing a response from the protection server to the intermediary proxy server (Column 7, line 46 to Column 8, line 59);

Allowing a service/information/content provider having accessed the protection server, to retrieve end user data and personal profile data according to a policy setting and end user privacy level over an API and a third communication protocol (Column 9, line 42 to Column 10, line 52; and Column 12, lines 4-16); and

Authentication via certificates and/or SSL (Column 8, lines 1-24);

But does not explicitly disclose the personal profile data protection server having a protection certificate and the verification of such certificate.

Yasala, however, discloses registering a certificate for an end user
personal profile protection server with a trusted third party (Paragraphs
27-31);

Providing a request for the certificate from the intermediary proxy
server to the protection server (Paragraphs 27-31);

Providing a response from the protection server to the intermediary
proxy server (Paragraphs 27-31);

Verifying, in the intermediary proxy server, that the certificate is
genuine, thereby belonging to the respective protection server and is
registered with the trusted third party (Paragraphs 27-31);

After confirmation that the protection server/certificate is genuine,
allowing authenticated communications to commence (Paragraphs 27-31).
It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of
applicant's invention to incorporate the authentication and authorization
system of Yasala into the trusted brokering system of Steele in order to
provide strong mutual authentication and/or authorization of both entities
such that a secure channel can be formed, while allowing each system to
decide who it trusts and who it does not trust.

Regarding Claim 24,

Steele as modified by Yasala discloses the method of claim 23, in
addition, Steele discloses establishing an end user personal profile data
security agreement between the intermediary proxy server and the

protection server (Figure 8, numeral 105; and Column 7, line 46 to Column 8, line 24); and Yasala discloses establishing an end user personal profile data security agreement between the intermediary proxy server and the protection server (Paragraphs 27-31).

Regarding Claim 30,

Steele as modified by Yasala discloses the method of claim 23, in addition, Steele discloses providing an API at the protection server, using the API for queries to the protection server from the service/information/content provider, providing responses over a third communication protocol to the service/information/content provider (Column 9, line 42 to Column 10, line 52; and Column 12, lines 4-16).

Regarding Claim 31,

Steele as modified by Yasala discloses the method of claim 30, in addition, Steele discloses storing data in a number of tables in the protection server relating to user specific data, end user personal profile data, and statistical data (Figures 3-4; and Column 14, line 10 to Column 16, line 4).

Regarding Claim 33,

Steele as modified by Yasala discloses the arrangement of claim 1, in addition, Steele discloses that the intermediary proxy server is located within a personal environment of the end user (Figure 8, numeral 105; and Column 7, line 46 to Column 8, line 24).

Regarding Claim 34,

> Steele as modified by Yasala discloses the arrangement of claim 1,
> in addition, Steele discloses that the intermediary proxy server is located
> within premises of the end user (Figure 8, numeral 105; and Column 7,
> line 46 to Column 8, line 24).

Regarding Claim 35,

> Steele as modified by Yasala discloses the arrangement of claim 1,
> in addition, Steele discloses that the intermediary proxy server is located
> within an intranet utilized by the end user (Figure 8, numeral 105; and
> Column 7, line 46 to Column 8, line 24).

4.   Claims 2, 7, 11, 14, 21, 22, 29, 32, 34, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.
103(a) as being unpatentable over Steele in view of Yasala, further in view of Gabber
(U.S. Patent 5,961,593).

Regarding Claim 2,

> Steele as modified by Yasala does not disclose that the first
> communication protocol is a secure protocol outside the user's computer.
> Gabber, however, discloses that the first communication protocol is
> a secure protocol outside the user's computer (Column 13, lines 15-53). It
> would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of
> applicant's invention to incorporate the proxy server system of Gabber into
> the trusted brokering system of Steele as modified by Yasala in order to

allow the user to obtain anonymous personalized browsing through a local

proxy which the user trusts, thereby allowing the user to acquire

personalized services without an entity outside the user's trusted space

knowing the user's identity.

Regarding Claim 7,

Steele as modified by Yasala does not disclose that the

intermediary proxy server is a proxy server outside the user's computer.

Gabber, however, discloses that the intermediary proxy server is a

HTTP proxy (Column 6, line 59 to Column 7, line 18; and Column 13, lines

15-53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of applicant's invention to incorporate the proxy server system of

Gabber into the trusted brokering system of Steele as modified by Yasala

in order to allow the user to obtain anonymous personalized browsing

through a local proxy which the user trusts, thereby allowing the user to

acquire personalized services without an entity outside the user's trusted

space knowing the user's identity.

Regarding Claim 11,

Steele as modified by Yasala does not disclose that the

intermediary proxy server is a proxy server outside the user's computer.

Gabber, however, discloses that the intermediary proxy server is

located within an intranet or at the operator's premises (Column 13, lines

15-53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of applicant's invention to incorporate the proxy server system of

Gabber into the trusted brokering system of Steele as modified by Yasala

in order to allow the user to obtain anonymous personalized browsing

through a local proxy which the user trusts, thereby allowing the user to

acquire personalized services without an entity outside the user's trusted

space knowing the user's identity.

Regarding Claim 14,

Steele as modified by Yasala does not disclose that the user

preferences related to privacy level are stored in the intermediary proxy

server.

Gabber, however, discloses that the user preferences related to

privacy level are stored in the intermediary proxy server (Column 11, lines

15-67; and Column 13, lines 15-53). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate

the proxy server system of Gabber into the trusted brokering system of

Steele as modified by Yasala in order to allow the user to obtain

anonymous personalized browsing through a local proxy which the user

trusts, thereby allowing the user to acquire personalized services without

an entity outside the user's trusted space knowing the user's identity.

Regarding Claim 21,

Steele as modified by Yasala does not explicitly disclose that the

end user specific data and end user personal profile data are provided to

the service/information/content provider in such a manner that the end

user cannot be traced by the service/information/content provider.

Gabber, however, discloses that the end user specific data and end

user personal profile data are provided to the service/information/content

provider in such a manner that the end user cannot be traced by the

service/information/content provider (Column 5, line 17 to Column 6, line

17; Column 6, line 59 to Column 7, line 18; Column 11, lines 15-67; and

Column 13, lines 15-53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the proxy

server system of Gabber into the trusted brokering system of Steele as

modified by Yasala in order to allow the user to obtain anonymous

personalized browsing through a local proxy which the user trusts, thereby

allowing the user to acquire personalized services without an entity

outside the user's trusted space knowing the user's identity.

Regarding Claim 22,

Steele as modified by Yasala and Gabber discloses the

arrangement of claim 21, in addition, Gabber discloses that the protection

server comprises means for pseudonymizing statistical information and

personal profile information by using a unique pseudo for each URL of the

service/information/content provider that is requested (Column 5, line 17

to Column 6, line 17; Column 6, line 59 to Column 7, line 18; Column 11,

lines 15-67; and Column 13, lines 15-53).

Regarding Claim 29,

Steele as modified by Yasala may not disclose that the end user preferences are stored in the end user station or in the intermediary proxy server, and in that they can be separately stored after confirmation of an agreement.

Gabber, however, discloses that the end user preferences are stored in the end user station or in the intermediary proxy server, and in that they can be separately stored after confirmation of an agreement (Column 5, line 17 to Column 6, line 17; Column 6, line 59 to Column 7, line 18; Column 11, lines 15-67; and Column 13, lines 15-53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the proxy server system of Gabber into the trusted brokering system of Steele as modified by Yasala in order to allow the user to obtain anonymous personalized browsing through a local proxy which the user trusts, thereby allowing the user to acquire personalized services without an entity outside the user's trusted space knowing the user's identity.

Regarding Claim 32,

Steele as modified by Yasala does not explicitly disclose pseudonymizing statistical data and profile information such that end user personal profile data cannot be associated or tied to the actual end user.

Gabber, however, discloses pseudonymizing statistical data and profile information such that end user personal profile data cannot be associated or tied to the actual end user (Column 5, line 17 to Column 6, line 17; Column 6, line 59 to Column 7, line 18; Column 11, lines 15-67; and Column 13, lines 15-53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the proxy server system of Gabber into the trusted brokering system of Steele as modified by Yasala in order to allow the user to obtain anonymous personalized browsing through a local proxy which the user trusts, thereby allowing the user to acquire personalized services without an entity outside the user's trusted space knowing the user's identity.

Regarding Claim 34,

Steele as modified by Yasala does not disclose that the intermediary proxy server is a proxy server outside the user's computer.

Gabber, however, discloses that the intermediary proxy server is located within premises of the end user (Column 13, lines 15-53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the proxy server system of Gabber into the trusted brokering system of Steele as modified by Yasala in order to allow the user to obtain anonymous personalized browsing through a local proxy which the user trusts, thereby allowing the user to acquire

personalized services without an entity outside the user's trusted space

knowing the user's identity.

Regarding Claim 35,

Steele as modified by Yasala does not disclose that the

intermediary proxy server is a proxy server outside the user's computer.

Gabber, however, discloses that the intermediary proxy server is

located within an intranet utilized by the end user (Column 13, lines 15-

53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time of applicant's invention to incorporate the proxy server system of

Gabber into the trusted brokering system of Steele as modified by Yasala

in order to allow the user to obtain anonymous personalized browsing

through a local proxy which the user trusts, thereby allowing the user to

acquire personalized services without an entity outside the user's trusted

space knowing the user's identity.

5.   Claims 13, 15-17, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Steele in view of Yasala, further in view of P3P ("P3P 1.0: A New

Standard in Online Privacy", 9/13/2000, pp. 1-6).

Regarding Claim 13,

Steele discloses that the user preferences are stored in the end

user station (Column 5, lines 31-43; and Column 7, line 24 to Column 8,

line 24); and Yasala discloses that the user preferences are stored in the

end user station (Paragraphs 34-39).

P3P also discloses that user preferences are stored in the end user

station (Pages 1-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the privacy

standard of P3P into the trusted brokering system of Steele as modified by

Yasala in order to allow the system to interoperate with other privacy

systems that implement the P3P standard, and/or to inform the user of

web site information policies.

Regarding Claim 15,

Steele as modified by Yasala and P3P discloses the arrangement

of claim 13, in addition, P3P discloses that the user preferences relating to

privacy level are stored in separate fast access storing means after

completion of the security communication agreement (Pages 1-5).

Regarding Claim 16,

Steele as modified by Yasala and P3P discloses the arrangement

of claim 15, in addition, Steele discloses that the protection server

comprises an API allowing service/information/content provider control of

site and page policies, and in that if an end user privacy level is increased,

data below the privacy level is deleted (Column 4, line 56 to Column 5,

line 43; Column 9, line 42 to Column 10, line 52; and Column 12, lines 4-

16).

Regarding Claim 17,

Steele as modified by Yasala and P3P discloses the arrangement

of claim 16, in addition, Yasala discloses that the protection server

provides certificates, and preferably signatures upon request by the

intermediary proxy server (Paragraphs 27-31).

Regarding Claim 25,

Steele as modified by Yasala does not explicitly disclose that the

agreement comprises a P3P agreement.

P3P, however, discloses that the agreement comprises a P3P

agreement (Pages 1-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the privacy

standard of P3P into the trusted brokering system of Steele as modified by

Yasala in order to allow the system to interoperate with other privacy

systems that implement the P3P standard, and/or to inform the user of

web site information policies.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Jeffrey D. Popham whose telephone number is (571)-

272-7215. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571)272-3865. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeffrey D Popham
Examiner
Art Unit 2137

EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER